DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 124 EC 191 745

AUTHOR Rusch, Frank R.; And Others

TITLE School-to-Work Research Needs.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Champaign. Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 86
CONTRACT 300-85-0160
NOTE 92p.; For related documents, see EC 191 736-746.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; Educational Researchers; *Education Work Relationship; Employment Potential; Interpersonal Competence; *Research Needs; Role Perception; Secondary Education; Surveys; *Transitional Programs

ABSTRACT

Part of a series, this document reports on an effort to identify and prioritize research questions of concern to researchers in the areas of educational and rehabilitation transitional services for the handicapped. In the first study 25 research questions were identified and submitted to external review and critique. In the second study, 112 project directors of federally funded transition projects, 58 state directors of vocational rehabilitation, 54 state directors of vocational education, and 27 research experts on transition, were asked to prioritize the importance of the 25 research questions. The most highly rated item recommends investigation of the most appropriate roles and responsibilities for families, teachers, rehabilitation counselors, and vocational educators in the transition planning process. Both the second and third most highly rated questions related to social skills in the workplace. A final study asked subjects of Study 2 to provide questions for the transition research group to address. Most proposed concerns were in the areas of transition model program research and development, program evaluation, and interagency collaboration. Appendices include a list of researchers involved in question enumeration, the potential research questions, a summary of reviewers' comments and revised questions, the survey questionnaire, a listing of questions in order of ranking, analysis of variance across respondent groups, and the proposed questions of the third study. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

7274

ED279124

School-to-Work Research Needs

DeStefano
Rusch

TRANSITION INSTITUTE AT ILLINOIS

EJ391745

The following principles guide our research related to the education and employment of youth and adults with specialized education, training, employment, and adjustment needs.

- Individuals have a basic right to be educated and to work in the environment that least restricts their right to learn and interact with other students and persons who are not handicapped.
- Individuals with varied abilities, social backgrounds, aptitudes, and learning styles must have equal access and opportunity to engage in education and work, and life-long learning.
- Educational experiences must be planned, delivered, and evaluated based upon the unique abilities, social backgrounds, and learning styles of the individual.
- Agencies, organizations, and individuals from a broad array of disciplines and professional fields must effectively and systematically coordinate their efforts to meet individual education and employment needs.
- Individuals grow and mature throughout their lives requiring varying levels and types of educational and employment support.
- The capability of an individual to obtain and hold meaningful and productive employment is important to the individual's quality of life.
- Parents, advocates, and friends form a vitally important social network that is an instrumental aspect of education, transition to employment, and continuing employment.

The Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute is funded through the Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education (contract number 300-85-0160).

Project Officer: Dr. Mel Appell

For more information on the Transition Institute at Illinois, please contact:

Dr. Frank R. Rusch, *Director*
College of Education
University of Illinois
110 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-2325

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

School-to-Work Research Needs

Frank R. Rusch,

Jeff McNair,

and

Lizanne DeStefano

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank R. Rusch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 191745

Abstract

Providing appropriate special education and transitional services relies to a great extent on identifying solutions to problems involved in the planning and delivery of these services. Although existing research has identified various problems that confront rehabilitation, vocational, and special education personnel, more specific information is needed that clearly defines the breadth of the problems facing researchers' efforts to identify and improve rehabilitation and educational interventions. This investigation identified these problem areas. The first study identified 25 questions of general concern; the second study prioritized these questions according to the input of selected researchers, model program developers, and administrators in rehabilitation, vocational, and special education. These questions are considered from a systems perspective and the overall results are analyzed in relation to how the 25 questions intercorrelated. Finally, each of the respondent groups were invited to provide questions and identify issues that could be addressed by the Transition Institute.

School-to-Work Research Needs

There has been a strong resurgence of interest in secondary education and transitional services that relate to students' employment preparation or to their obtaining employment directly. This resurgence of interest is a direct reflection of national priorities that have been identified by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) (Will, 1984). Since 1983, over 100 grants have been awarded to study various aspects of students' "transition" from school to work. Because of the sizeable amount of money being allocated to secondary special education and transition issues, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign was contracted with to evaluate OSERS' overall investment. A portion of this contract seeks solutions to problems experienced by youth with handicaps in transition by identifying and addressing new research priorities.

To date, several national surveys have been conducted related to improving aspects of secondary education and transitional services for persons with handicaps (Greenan, 1980; Phelps & Greenan, 1982; Stodden, 1981). However, none of these studies have sought to identify research priorities related to the development of methods that improve employment opportunity. For example, Howard (1979) conducted a needs assesment in Arizona, Maine, Montana, and South Dakota. This needs assessment utilized an interview technique whereby state directors of vocational rehabilitation, special education, vocational education and their staffs were interviewed. Also interviewed were individuals representing other agencies and organizations such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Indian Education, vocational-technical schools, state legislators and

CETA. Interagency cooperation, personnel development, funding, service delivery/program options, program evaluation and service to Native American and other minority handicapped youth were identified as needing special attention. Davis and Ward (1978) also identified vocational assessment, individualized programming and training plans, identification of students, program placement and facilities and equipment modification as important problems.

In addition, Phelps and Thornton (1979) surveyed state vocational rehabilitation directors and other State Education Agency (SEA) personnel, professional association officers, advocates and consumers, teacher educators, and state advisory councils for vocational education. They identified interagency planning and service delivery, individualized programming, program placement, and personnel development as significant problems confronting organizations and agencies concerned with improving vocational/rehabilitation opportunities for persons with handicaps.

In a more recent study, Greenan and Phelps (1979) found that interagency cooperation and agreements and funding consisted of over 50 percent of the problems identified by state education agency personnel. Other problems identified included: (a) service delivery and program alternatives, (b) personnel development, (c) state legislation, plans and policies, (d) federal legislation and regulation, (e) attitudes, and (f) program evaluation and improvement.

The efficient delivery of essential secondary education and transitional services to youth with handicaps is dependent upon identifying and solving diverse problems. However, although studies have been conducted, more specific information is needed to identify applied research problems. For example, the need exists to further identify

specific problems so that research can be undertaken to improve the delivery of services to youth with handicaps in transition from school-to-work.

The purpose of this investigation was to identify new and/or improved interventions or features of interventions that would result in the development of methods enhancing transition from school-to-work. Consequently, the first study in this investigation identified potential research questions by enlisting the feedback of nationally-recognized researchers in the areas of secondary education and transition services. Following the identification of potential research questions, a second study was undertaken to prioritize these questions according to feedback from selected researchers, program developers, and state directors in the areas of rehabilitation, vocational, and special education. Additionally, survey respondents were asked to generate additional questions and/or issues they believed that the Transition Institute at Illinois should consider.

Methods

Subjects

Twenty-five researchers known for their work on transition issues were selected from across the United States. These researchers were selected by nomination from faculty affiliated with the Transition Institute. Researchers consisted of university researchers and researchers/policy analysts, including researchers/policy analysts from OSERS (see Appendix A for a complete list of these researchers).

Research Question Development

Before the contract was awarded to the University of Illinois, faculty were requested to submit potential research questions addressing transition issues that might guide their research programs. These questions were prepared with the recognition that youth in transition from school-to-work experience multiple barriers. These barriers require that intervention strategies be developed at several levels of potential impact, including strategies that seek to improve transition at the individual, group, community, and larger societal levels. This perspective is not unique to the faculty at the University of Illinois, but reflects relatively recent recognition of multiple systems that simultaneously operate to enhance or limit individual and group development in a complex society.

As a guiding perspective, the Institute identified four levels of analysis that initially would guide their research. Briefly, at the individual level, intervention strategies were identified that would help persons directly working with students with handicaps (e.g., teachers, parents, friends). At the group level, intervention strategies were identified to facilitate interpersonal cooperation within functional groups (e.g., peer groups, work crews, and among teachers). Community-level intervention strategies that help to influence organizations reflect their values (e.g., school districts promoting social and physical integration of students with handicaps, employers allowing restructuring of jobs to match the unique needs of individuals with handicaps were also identified). Finally, at the societal level interventions were identified that sought to alter broader societal foundations from which the less inclusive levels of analysis function. The underlying assumption is that

the individual, small group, or community is most significantly influenced by changes in the social-political-ethnic values of the society that dictates the structure and the function of the other levels (e.g., labor laws' influence on job training programs for youth, social security limits on wages and period of gainful employment on the efforts to employ students who require extended support to remain employed).

A total of 31 questions were submitted to OSERS (see Appendix B). These questions were then sent to each of the 25 researchers with a letter explaining the purpose of this study, describing the types of responses desired from respondents, and indicating that they would be contacted by telephone to schedule a subsequent telephone interview (see Appendix C for a copy of the letter).

These researchers were then contacted by the second author approximately one week after the letter and questions were mailed. At this time, interview appointments were made. In several cases, however, the interview took place at the time of the initial telephone contact. When interviewed, respondent's permission was requested to tape the conversation. In all cases permission was granted. Respondents were reminded of the research goals of the Transition Institute and asked if they wished to recommend a revision for any one of the proposed questions. Possible revisions included changing words to enhance clarity, adding entire phrases to more fully describe the intent of the research question, entirely rewriting a question, deleting a question altogether, or adding a new question. At the completion of the taped interviews, the respondent's comments were transcribed by the second author.

Results and Discussion

Input was received from 21 of the 25 researchers. This feedback led to 25 questions being added to the original 31 questions, resulting in a

total of 56 questions. Of these 56 questions, 25 were referred to the Evaluation Research Program of the Transition Institute because of their focus upon program evaluation, four were deleted altogether because they overlapped with existing questions, and two were combined with other questions (see Appendix D for detail related to the original question, comments received from the respondents, and the form the question took when the comments were considered by the authors in relation to the original question). The remaining 25 questions, having been significantly revised, were used in Part 2 of the School-to-Work Research Needs Study. Table 1 lists these 25 questions.

Insert Table 1 about here

The primary purpose of Study 1 was to subject the original list of questions generated by the Transition Institute to external review and critique. Twenty-five researchers were selected by nomination and requested to provide qualitative feedback regarding these questions. Further, these researchers were invited to recommend additional questions; a total of 25 questions were recommended. Overall, the major influence of this group of selected researchers was their broadening the scope of the questions. For example, if a question focused upon one strategy (e.g., self control) the respondents recommended focusing upon "rules" or "general strategies." Similarly, if a question focused upon specific skills (e.g., social skills in the workplace), the researchers usually suggested identifying "requisite" skills needed "across work settings." Finally, in several cases the target population was broadened to include students and young adults with mild handicaps.

The resulting list of questions served to focus the national survey described below. Specifically, the purpose of Study 2 was to subject these questions to a national sample of survey respondents who potentially represented the interest of their consumers in an effort to prioritize the importance of the questions.

Study 2

Survey Sample

The survey sample consisted of federally-funded transition project directors, state directors of special education, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation, and researchers. Of the 115 federally-funded projects, 112 project directors were contacted (three persons directed two projects). Projects included those funded by the Office of Special Education Programs and the National Institute on Handicapped Research. The state directors of special education included 58 respondents (including American Samoa, Guam, Washington, D.C., Mariana Islands, Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico). The state directors of vocational rehabilitation also included a group of 58 respondents (including American Samoa, Guam, Mariana Islands, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation [CSAVR]). There were 54 state directors of vocational education (including American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands).

The research group included 26 experts working on transition issues. These individuals were selected by referring to the editorial boards of journals associated with special education (i.e., Exceptional Children, Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, Journal of Learning Disabilities, Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded), vocational rehabilitation (i.e., Journal of Rehabilitation,

Rehabilitation Literature), and vocational education (i.e., Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education). Including all respondent groups, a total of 308 surveys were mailed.

Survey Instrument Development

The 25 questions identified in Study 1 were randomly listed on the survey instrument (see Appendix E). A 10-point scale was used for respondents to rate each question. A response of "1" indicated a rating of "Absolutely Essential," a rating of "5" indicated "Moderately Important," and a rating of "10" indicated "Not at All Important." Additionally, respondents could circle 98 indicating a "Don't Know" response.

A letter accompanying the survey briefly described the goals of the survey, as well as a return date and instructions regarding how to respond (see Appendix F). Particular mention was made of the "Don't Know" response. If a question was not rated then the "Don't Know" option was circled by the authors; also, if a question was marked more than once, the "Don't Know" response was used.

A glossary was included to assist respondents with terminology they might not be familiar with. The five terms provided were identified by ten persons who were not working professionally with students with handicaps (e.g., secretaries, store managers, regular education teachers). Lastly, a demographic section polled such variables as race, place of residence, experience, and education.

Survey Mailing

Surveys were mailed in a staggered fashion. Surveys were first mailed to all project directors, one week later to researchers, one week later to state directors of special education, and one week later to state directors of vocational education and vocational rehabilitation. In all,

except the state directors of vocational rehabilitation group, follow-up letters were sent three weeks following the initial mailing (see Appendix G). In the case of state directors of vocational rehabilitation, follow-up letters were sent four weeks later. After the initial mailing, several state directors of vocational rehabilitation indicated that they would not respond until we received approval from the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR). CSAVR approval was obtained after the Council contacted the Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services for clarification of the Transition Institute's goals. Director Susan Suter (an Institute Advisory Committee Member) recommended that the Council approve the survey. A letter to this effect followed the original mailing by four weeks.

Data Analysis

Data from the completed questionnaires were subjected to a series of descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. The cover sheet of each questionnaire contained demographic information such as respondents' job title, highest degree earned, area of study, nature of work, population served, region of the country, and length of time in the field. This information and the frequency of response to each question was used to develop a descriptive summary profile of each of the three major categories of respondents (i.e., researchers, model program developers, and state directors in rehabilitation, vocational education and special education). Demographic variables were also used to stratify the data for additional analysis described below.

Each individual item was rated on a ten-point Likert-type scale with one indicating the highest priority rating. As an aide to interpretation, each rating was transformed so that a higher rating indicated higher priority. These transformed means and standard deviations were computed

for the ratings of each group. These measures of central tendency were used to determine the relative priority of each of the 25 research questions. This relative priority was computed for the entire sample and for each of the three respondent categories.

One and two-way analyses of variance were run among the priority ratings of the three categories of respondents to identify commonalities and differences between group in the priority ratings for individual items. The results of this analysis were interpreted to identify areas of common concern among the categories of respondents, as well as the unique research priorities of a particular group.

Results and Discussion

Demographic Characteristics

Several items were included to identify the respondents. These items included questions relating to their current position, the setting in which they worked, who was their subject population and whether they had experience with this population (three items). Of project directors who responded (N=78), the clear majority were special educators (N=19), university faculty (N=25), or project directors (N=49), however, in most cases respondents checked more than one item. Only 11 respondents considered themselves a vocational educator (N = 3) or vocational rehabilitation counselor (N = 8). Project directors worked in university settings (N = 24), regular attendance schools (N = 23), private agencies (N = 14, and within state government (N = 10) or segregated school settings (N = 9). The subject population included primarily students with learning disabilities (N = 45), moderate mental retardation (N = 39), mild mental retardation (N = 31), or multiple handicaps (N = 30). All remaining categories were fairly equally represented.

Regarding prior experience, most project directors had worked more than 5 years (N = 60), within the last 3 years (N = 70), with students who were learning disabled (N = 55) and/or mildly or moderately mentally retarded (N = 59 and 56, respectfully). Each of the remaining categories were fairly equally represented. Finally, 36 project directors had completed advance graduate studies and 33 had completed a master's degree.

The research group consisted of 17 respondents who identified themselves as University personnel (N=14) who worked in university settings (N=14), primarily. These researchers were primarily working with students with moderate and severe mental retardation (N = 9 in both cases) or with students with physical handicaps or mild mental retardation (N = 6 in both cases), which also reflected their experience. Not surprisingly, this group received their advanced degrees without exception. Related to clinical experience, the majority had more than 10 years of experience (N = 9) with no one having less than 2-3 years of experience.

The state directors represented the most diverse group of professionals in each of the demographic categories. For our purposes here, the opinions of each group of administrators were summed to reflect policy planners and developers. The clear majority of state directors were either special educators (N = 30) or vocational educators (N = 23) and state directors (N = 88). The number of vocational rehabilitation professionals responding was not identifiable through the survey. The only category for identification purposes was "vocational rehabilitation counselor." These state directors work primarily within state government (N = 83) and schools (N = 34). All respondents indicated that they work equally with students with learning disabilities (N = 68), mild mental

retardation (N = 64), and moderate mental retardation (N = 67). The remaining categories were relatively equal in terms of absolute frequency if directors indicating they work with students with disabilities. Forty-three percent of the directors indicated they served students with autism (the lowest percent) and 55 percent indicated that they served persons with physical handicaps (the highest percent). The remaining categories fell within these two extremes.

The experiences of these state directors correlate highly with the population they serve, with the three highest "past experience" groups being those with learning disabilities, mild mental retardation, and moderate mental retardation. Similarly, the lowest percentages related to autism with the highest being physical disabilities and the remaining falling between these two extremes.

State directors reflected the highest number of years of experience with 73 percent indicating more than five years of experience. The state directors' past experience was obtained within the past four to ten years (N = 38) or more than ten years ago (N = 34). The majority received their masters degree (N = 70) or their doctorate (N = 27). Fourteen reported completing a bachelors degree or a specialists degree.

Priority Rankings

Based upon the mean ratings for each item, the 25 research questions were rank order of (see Appendix H). Questions received mean ratings which ranged from a low of 7.18 for Question 25 to a high of 8.97 for Question 9 (10 being high, 1 being low). Table 2 displays the means for the total group as well as for each of the respondent groups. The most highly rated question was number 9. This question recommends investigation

of the most appropriate roles and responsibilities for families, teachers, rehabilitation counselors, and vocational educators in the transition

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

planning process. The second and third most highly rated questions related to social skills in the workplace. Question 13, the second most highly rated question, addresses social survival skills and how they can either be taught or compensated for in the workplace. The third most highly rated question, number 6, asks what types of behaviors are viewed as most aversive or most positive by significant other (e.g., coworkers, supervisors, customers in the workplace).

Analysis of Variance

To test the concordance of ratings among respondent groups, an analysis of variance was completed. Results showed that in all but five cases, the three groups' ratings were not significantly different (see Appendix I). The first of the five questions in which there was a significant difference was Question 2, which asked, "What rules can be formulated to guide teachers systematic withdrawal of their instructional programs to facilitate students' independence." In this case, project directors' ratings were significantly higher than state directors' ratings. For question 8, which asked, "If students/youth are taught to evaluate social situations, what impact will this have on improving their social performance on the job," project directors' ratings were significantly higher than researchers' ratings.

Probably the most interesting difference occurred with Question 10. This question asked "What intervention and collaborative strategies are most efficient for facilitating interagency cooperation, and how can these strategies be implemented at the local agency level?" Project directors' and state directors' ratings were both significantly higher than researchers' ratings. No doubt state directors and project directors face interagency collaboration problems on a fairly regular basis. A fourth significant difference was observed for Question 16, which asked, "What social skill teaching strategies introduced in one setting will result in generalized performance in a second setting (e.g., simulated v. natural, residential v. employment, instructional v. noninstructional)?" In this instance, project directors rated the question as significantly more important than state directors. This may be due to the project directors direct experience with students. Lastly, in Question 18, which asked, "How has the "state of the economy" influenced the nature of employment training programs offered to persons with handicaps," researchers' ratings were significantly higher than state directors' ratings. Perhaps the most notable result, however, is that in 20 of the 25 questions, there were no significant differences among respondents. Such a finding lends support to the importance and the summary ranking of the questions.

Study 3

As indicated above, this study reports on the questions that were submitted by the respondents.

Data Collection and Analysis

The sample utilized in Study 3 was the same as that reported in Study 2. However, the goal of this study was to analyze/categorize respondents' answers to the open-ended statement, "Please supply us with questions you

would like to see our research group address." Of the 207 surveys returned, 67 surveys included written responses in this section. These responses included potential research questions as requested, as well as comments relative to areas of future research. There were a total of 120 questions/comments. Project directors contributed the most questions/comments (n=59); State directors (n=41) and researchers (n=9) also contributed.

Input was examined by the second author and coding categories were identified. All three authors then met and the final list of coding categories was agreed upon and defined (see Appendix J). The group then proceeded to assign the questions/comments to a particular category. Each group member indicated their category selection for a specific question/comment. If there was a disagreement, the group discussed the category assignment until there was unanimous agreement on category assignment.

Results and Discussion

Of the 120 questions/comments, 109 were included in the analysis. Eleven questions/comments were not included due to their lack of relevance to the Institute's research program. For example, comment #53 (see Appendix K) addresses how "limited fiscal and personnel resources" should be a determinant in who receives services. The implication is that persons with "limited potential...requires services that are (of) very high cost" and that perhaps the emphasis should be placed on research which"...will truly contribute to the knowledge base to assist in serving the greatest portion of the disabled population." This comment runs in

stark contrast to the position of the Institute. The Institute asserts that money should not dictate service provision, but rather, opportunities should dictate services. Persons should not be denied opportunities by virtue of the severity of their handicapping condition. In other words, there should be equal employment opportunity for all persons with handicaps.

Of the 11 possible categories (see Appendix L), the majority of questions/comments (n=32) were assigned to Category 2; Transition Model Program Research and Development. This is potentially a result of a) the thrust of the open-ended directive statement and/or b) the broadness of the category. Questions/comments included in this category related to educational strategies, variations among transition programs, assessment, and/or program logistics. The remainder of the questions/comments were fairly evenly distributed across the remaining 10 categories, with Category 9; Business/Industry Linkages, and Category 11; Other, having the least number of questions/comments.

The percentage of researcher responses was highest for Category 1; Inservice/Preservice Training. This might be expected due to the nature of many of the researcher's university affiliated positions (see Demographic section, Study 2) and the lack of qualified personnel in a new priority area.

State directors showed the most interest in Transition Model Program Research and Development (Category 2), followed by Program Evaluation (Category 8), Business/Industry Linkages (Category 10), and Federal/state Legislation and Policy (Category 7) and Inservice/preservice Training (Category 1).

Project directors' questions/comments indicated the most interest of the three groups in Transition Model Program Research and Development (Category 2), Parent/Advocate Involvement (Category 5), Program Evaluation (Category 8), and Interagency Collaboration (Category 10). Each of these categories in some way relate to model program development, which would be expected of project directors' efforts to develop model programs in their communities.

Several interesting questions did not fit into any one category and were therefore relegated to Category 11; Other. These questions related to subsidized employment, adaptability versus socialization, aspirations of persons with handicaps, and aspects of transition roles.

Study 3 provided the opportunity to examine issues each of the three groups emphasized through self-derived questions. Clearly, there were no surprises as far as the types of questions/comments each group generated, yet nomination of additional questions in specific areas of interest to each group should not be construed as a lack of interest in any of the other category areas. Rather, those additional questions which were generated should only accentuate issues of predominant interest to the various groups. The variety of questions generated by the groups supports the broad scope of problems facing youth in transition.

General Summary

The purpose of this series of investigations was threefold. First, the Transition Institute of Illinois comprises a group of researchers who have mutual, yet diverse, interests. There researchers generated a list of questions for potential study, which represented their own interests in secondary education and transitional services. This original list of questions was disseminated to a group of 25 well-known research and policy analysis professionals in the area of secondary transitional services throughout the United States. Respondents suggested numerous revisions and additions. Largely, the revisions broadened the scope of the questions to include individuals with diverse handicaps. Other recommendations included rewording questions as well as adding new questions for possible study.

Second, a study was undertaken to prioritize the remaining questions from most important to least important. Also, this study sought to determine whether there was any significant differences between a national sample of researchers, state directors of vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation, and project directors. The results of this study indicated that questions related to social skills and families were most highly ranked. Five of the top 10 questions related to social skills; three of the top 10 questions related to families. There were five questions where significant differences between the groups existed. Two of three questions were among the top 10 or 11 questions and both focused upon social skills. In both cases researchers rated the questions higher than state directors.

The final study in this investigation focused upon questions that the respondents in Study 2 submitted on their own behalf. Three general

categories were most often cited, including transition model program research and development, program evaluation, and interagency collaboration. In the first category respondents indicated interest in research and development activity in the specific areas of educational strategies, variations among programs, assessment, and program logistics (e.g., transportation). Although three categories surfaced as representing areas of potential research and development, one other category also surfaced as being potentially important. Researchers, state directors, and project directors were equally concerned about professional training in areas related to transition. No other category was equally represented.

In summary, this investigation contributes to several rational surveys that have focused upon improving secondary education and transitional services for persons with handicaps. Most significantly, this investigation focuses upon identifying research priorities that relate to the development of interventions that would potentially improve employment opportunities. In support of existing research, this investigation did find that issues related to model program development (Howard, 1979; Greenan & Phelps, 1979), personnel development (Greenan & Phelps, 1979; Howard, 1979; Phelps & Thornton, 1979), program evaluation (Howard, 1979), and interagency collaboration (Howard, 1979; Phelps & Thornton, 1979) were still recognized as areas deserving of more study.

References

Davis, S., & Ward, M. (1978). Vocational education of handicapped students: A guide for policy development. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Greenan, J. P. (Ed.). (1980). Interagency cooperation and agreements (Policy Paper Series No. 4). Urbana: University of Illinois, Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education.

Greenan, J. P., & Phelps, L. A. (1979). Policy-related problems for delivering vocational education to handicapped learners as perceived by state education agency personnel. Urbana: University of Illinois, Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education.

Howard, R. (1979). Vocational education of handicapped youth: State of the art. Washington, DC: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Phelps, L. A., & Greenan, J. P. (1982). CETA/vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation linkages. (Policy Paper Series No. 5). Urbana: University of Illinois, Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education.

Phelps, L. A., & Thornton, L. J. (1979). Vocational education and handicapped learners: Perception and inservice needs of state leadership personnel. Urbana: University of Illinois, Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education.

Stodden, R. A. (Ed.). (1981). Vocational assessment. (Policy Paper Series No. 6). Urbana: University of Illinois, Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education.

Will, M. (1984). Bridges from schools to working life. Programs for the Handicapped, March/April, 2.

Table 1. List of revised questions that resulted from considering the feedback obtained from 25 nationally known researchers.

Individual Level Questions

Question #1

What type of self-instructional package can students use to develop their independence on the job? What components of this package contribute most in accounting for students becoming independent?

Question #2

If general-case programming is used to teach vocational skills/behaviors outside the work setting, how effectively will these target skills/behaviors generalize to actual work settings?

Question #3

Does social skill training conducted in an employment setting increase positive interactions with coworkers and decrease negative interactions/inappropriate behaviors, and if so, how?

Question #4

If students/youth are taught to evaluate social situations, what impact will this have on improving their social performance on the job?

Question #5

What requisite social skills are necessary across work settings? If students do not possess these requisite skills, how should these skills be taught or otherwise compensated for in the work environment?

Question #6

What naturally occurring social cues set the occasion for other social skills in the workplace and how can we teach students/youth to respond appropriately to these cues?

Question #7

What social skill interventions introduced in one setting result in generalized performance in a second setting (e.g., simulated v. natural, residential v. employment, instructional v. noninstructional)?

Question #8

What rules can be formulated to guide teachers' systematic withdrawal of their instructional programs to facilitate students' independence?

Question #9

Can transitional strategies that result in meaningful employment for the individual be used to facilitate recreational and residential adjustment?

Small Group Level Questions

Question #1

What strategies do family and friends use to help youth with handicaps adjust to their job? Can the effective components of these strategies be isolated and combined to yield one strategy that can be taught to advocates/significant others in the work setting?

Question #2

What interests/interaction patterns exist among potential coworkers and how can this information be used to facilitate employment for youth with handicaps?

Question #3

What job conditions and/or incentives are most effective for increasing the likelihood that coworkers will a) act as advocates, b) participate in data collection, and/or c) participate in training?

Question #4
What strategies are most effective for enlisting parents' support for transition planning that focuses upon integrated, paid employment?
Question #5
How can coworkers be effectively trained to assist in the training of work-related behaviors?
Question #6
What behaviors evidenced in social interactions are viewed as most aversive by coworkers, supervisors, customers, or equally significant others within the work environment? What social behaviors are viewed as most positive by this group?
Question #7
How can employees with handicaps be integrated into social events, activities, and networks associated with work settings (e.g., off-site parties, athletic teams)?

Community Level Questions
Question #1
What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part time employment, voluntary work) facilitate successful employment for persons with mild to severe handicaps, physical disabilities, etc.?
Question #2
What intervention and collaborative strategies are most efficient for facilitating interagency cooperation, and how can these strategies be implemented at the LEA level?
Question #3
What are the most appropriate roles and responsibilities for families, teachers, rehabilitation counselors, and vocational educators in the transition planning process? When should this process start?
Question #4
What are employer's and coworker's attitudes regarding working with employees with handicaps, and vice versa? Do these attitudes vary as a function of handicapping condition/severity, job type, and prior exposure to the other group?
Question #5
What interventions can be developed that change negative attitudes of coworkers and employers toward persons with handicaps? Do these changes affect overall community employment trends?
Question #6
What attitudes are portrayed by key individuals in the local media regarding persons with disabilities? What effect do these attitudes have on community integration? What strategies should educational/rehabilitation agencies use to promote positive portrayal?

Societal Level Questions
Question #1
In what ways have recently revised social security regulations (e.g., eligibility) produced significant changes in the number of persons participating in income maintenance programs (e.g., SSI)?
Question #2
How has the "state of the economy" influenced the nature of employment training programs offered to persons with handicaps?

Question #3

Who develops income maintenance program policies for individuals with handicaps? Upon what information base do they develop these policies? Which group or key individuals influence these policy makers? What interventions can be developed to influence these policy makers to formulate new guidelines that support independence?

Table 2.

Total group and individual respondent group means*

Question	Total Group	Project Directors	Researchers	State Directors
#1	7.94	8.26	8.33	7.67
#2	7.79	8.14	8.33	7.47
#3	7.84	7.71	8.42	7.85
#4	7.53	7.47	7.25	7.60
#5	7.47	7.71	7.75	7.26
#6	8.54	8.67	8.93	8.39
#7	7.39	7.41	7.21	7.41
#8	8.22	8.60	7.14	8.09
#9	8.97	8.96	8.50	9.05
#10	8.52	8.63	6.86	8.68
#11	7.33	7.46	7.19	7.26
#12	8.20	8.39	8.00	8.08
#13	8.61	8.76	8.19	8.57
#14	7.80	7.82	8.06	7.75
#15	7.74	7.77	8.38	7.61
#16	7.83	8.19	8.29	7.48
#17	7.57	7.71	6.50	7.62
#18	7.19	7.12	6.00	7.43
#19	7.55	7.78	7.50	7.38
#20	7.75	7.59	7.79	7.87
#21	7.28	7.04	7.38	7.43
#22	7.90	7.87	7.94	7.92
#23	8.42	8.45	8.19	8.43
#24	7.28	7.21	8.06	7.21
#25	7.18	7.00	7.25	7.30

*10 is High, 1 is low

Appendix A

Researchers Involved in Question Enumeration

Martin Agran, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
Utah State University

Susan Asselin, Ph.D.
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Paul Bates, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
Southern Illinois University

G. Thomas Bellamy, Ph.D.
Specialized Training Program
University of Oregon

Donn Brolin, Ph.D.
Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology
University of Missouri-Columbia

James Brown, Ph.D.
Department of Vocational Technical Education
University of Minnesota

Lou Brown, Ph.D.
Dept. of Studies & Behavioral Disabilities
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Gary M. Clark, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
University of Kansas

Robert Gaylord-Ross, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
San Francisco State University

James P. Greenan, Ph.D.
School of Humanities, Social Services, and Education
Vocational Education Section
Purdue University

William Halloran, Ph.D.
Office of Special Education Programs
Office of Special Education & Rehabilitative Services

Susan Hasazi, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
University of Vermont

Dean Inman, Ph.D.
Center on Human Development
University of Oregon

Orv Karan, Ph.D.
Waisman Center
University of Wisconsin-Madison

James E. Martin, Ph.D.
School of Education
University of Colorado

Richard Melia, Ph.D.
National Institute of Handicapped Research
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Dennis E. Mithaug, Ph.D.
School of Education
University of Colorado

Linda H. Parrish, Ph.D.
Vocational Special Needs Education
College of Education

Ian Pumpian, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
San Diego State University

Robert L. Schalock, Ph.D.
Psychology Department
Hastings College

Joe Stowitchek, Ph.D.
Developmental Center for Handicapped Persons
Utah State University

Timm Vogelsberg, Ph.D.
Developmental Disabilities Center
Temple University

David Wacker, Ph.D.
Division of Developmental Disabilities
University of Iowa

Richard T. Walls, Ph.D.
Rehabilitation Research and Training
Center
West Virginia University

Paul Wehman, Ph.D.
Rehabilitation Research and
Training Center
Virginia Commonwealth University

Appendix B

Potential Research Questions

Individual Level

Question 1: Can a self-instructional package be developed that holds promise for general use across diverse employment settings and target behaviors when the objective is to enhance student autonomy?

Question 2: If general-case programming is applied to the construction of role plays in simulated settings, will the target of the role play generalize to target settings?

Question 3: If social skills are taught in the context of the employment setting, will maladaptive behaviors decrease?

Question 4: Most interventions directed at teaching social skills focus upon social performance. If social decoding skills are taught, will this strategy improve the acquisition and generalization of social behaviors in the employment setting?

Question 5: What social skills are required to be successful in the workplace? Do these skills have generality across settings?

Question 6: What are the naturally occurring cues that set the occasion for the display of social skills in the workplace and can we bring these skills under this very subtle, yet appropriate, stimulus control?

Question 7: Can social skill interventions introduced within residential and recreation/leisure settings result in generalized performance within vocational settings?

Question 8: What is the most effective way to incorporate self control, withdrawal techniques and general case programming in order to facilitate vocational community integration?

Small Group Level

Question 1: Do intervention strategies exist that can be used to change selected small groups (i.e., family, peers, work groups) viewed as instrumental in facilitating the transition from school to work? And, if no strategies exist, can the components of such a strategy be identified and developed?

Question 2: If individuals with handicaps are to be integrated into employment settings, it is essential that the ecology of those settings be studied and more fully understood. For example, little is known about the interest/interaction patterns displayed by potential coworkers in entry level service occupations. What are important interests/interaction patterns and how can this information be used to facilitate employment?

Question 3: What reinforcers are most effective for increasing the likelihood that coworkers will (a) act as advocates, (b) participate in data collection, and/or (c) participate in training?

Question 4: What strategies are most effective for convincing parents that their children should work in nonsheltered settings?

Question 5: In relation to Question 1, how can families, peers and work groups facilitate the transition? Is this known?

Question 6: Should peers be introduced early in training to help with training or later after some skills have been acquired?

Question 7: What behaviors evidenced in social interactions are viewed as most aversive by coworkers? What social behaviors are viewed as most positive by coworkers?

Question 8: How can handicapped workers best be integrated into social events, activities and networks associated with work settings (e.g., off-site parties, athletic teams, etc.)?

Community Level

Question 1: What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part-time employment and voluntary work) facilitate success on the job for mildly versus severely handicapped persons?

Question 2: What intervention and collaborative strategies are most effective for facilitating interagency cooperation?

Question 3: Who should initiate the transition planning process (e.g., teachers, rehabilitation counselors, vocational educators)?

Question 4: What are employers' and coworkers' attitudes regarding working with handicapped persons?

Question 5: Are there characteristics of a business that would make it more accepting of persons with handicaps?

Question 6: What family actions, public and private services and factors such as coordination and sequencing of services, lead to the attainment of employment?

Question 7: What family actions lead to the attainment of higher status jobs with better conditions of employment?

Question 8: Can secondary and post-secondary services be identified that have specific positive effects on self-sufficiency and social satisfaction with regard to employment and independent living? How do these identified service factors compare with services offered to persons who are not handicapped?

Question 9: What are the attitudes toward mentally handicapped persons held by key individuals within the local media? What affect do these attitudes have on vocational community integration?

Societal Level

Question 1: Have recently revised social security regulations resulted in significant changes in the number of persons participating in income maintenance programs (e.g., Social Security)?

Question 2: How does the state of the economy affect the type of adult vocational services that are offered to persons with handicaps?

Question 3: Do social trends (studied via historical analysis) in attitudes toward social services affect employment of persons with handicaps?

Question 4: Is there a relationship between the state of the economy and societal attitudes toward persons with handicaps?

Question 5: Who defines SSI policy? Upon what information base do they develop these policies? Which group or key individuals influence these policy makers?

Question 6: What conditions (economic, political, etc.) existed prior to times of significant positive change in societal attitudes toward the handicapped, and how were these conditions facilitated?

Appendix C

Letter of Intent

October 7, 1985

//2//

Dear //3//,

The Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute, a project funded through the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, was recently established at the University of Illinois to study issues relating to the transition of handicapped persons from school to work. To guide our research activities over the next five years, we are conducting a National Research Needs Assessment Survey. Phase one of this effort involves a telephone interview of distinguished researchers in the area of transition.

The focus of the Research Program is to identify research questions that are of a high priority to various consumer groups. Questions have been prepared at four levels of analysis (see attached). At the individual level, intervention strategies assist persons directly serving handicapped individuals. At the small group level, intervention strategies are designed to facilitate interpersonal cooperation within functional groups (families, peer groups, work groups). Community level intervention strategies help influence organizations to reflect their values, e.g. conscientious communities are working toward social integration. Lastly, societal level interactions seek to alter the broad societal foundation over which the three other levels function. The underlying assumption is that the individual is most significantly influenced by changes in the social-political-ethnic values of the culture which dictate the structure and function of social institutions, e.g., labor laws, social legislation.

Because of your expertise in this area, we would like to solicit your feedback regarding the questions our survey instrument might contain. Jeff McNair, a graduate assistant working on this project, will be contacting you within one week, to schedule a convenient time for a 15 minute interview. At the time of the interview, we ask that you consider the following alternatives for each question:

Page 2

1) is the question clear in its present form, 2) should the question be revised, and what is your suggested revision, 3) should the question be deleted, and 4) are there additional questions which you would add. We hope to complete all interviews before October 18th.

We look forward to the opportunity of speaking with you personally, and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Rusch
Director
Secondary Transition Intervention
Effectiveness Institute

FRR:skd5p

Enc.

Appendix D

Original Questions, Reviewers' Comments, and Revised Questions

INDIVIDUAL LEVEL QUESTIONS

Question #1

Can a self-instructional package be developed that holds promise for general use across diverse employment settings and target behaviors when the objective is to enhance student autonomy?

Comments

-unclear (5)
-doesn't make sense
-is this possible?
-what are the components of self-instructional packages that can be used to enhance student autonomy?
-can a self instructional package be developed that holds promise for general use across diverse employment settings and target behaviors?
-can a self instructional package be developed that holds promise for general use across diverse employment settings and target behaviors when the objective is to enhance student autonomy and adaptability?
-(add) is concurrent use of simulation and a natural work site for training more effective than simulation followed by work site training (concurrent v. consecutive use of simulation and natural environments?
(see Question #7)
-(add) do differential effects occur across different types of self-control packages?
(added to question)

Revised Question

What type of self-instructional package can students' use to develop their independence on the job? What components of this package contribute most in accounting for students becoming independent?

Question #2

If general-case programming is applied to the construction of role plays in simulated settings, will the target of the role play generalize to target settings?

Comments

-unclear (3)
-employment settings is too diverse...skeptical that effective general case model can be developed that is generalizable across such a wide vareity of employment settings...if geared toward more of a limited range of employment settings, maybe.

Revised Question

If general-case programming is used to teach vocational skills/behaviors outside the work setting, how effectively will these target skills/behaviors generalize to actual work settings?

Question #3

If social skills are taught in the context of the employment setting will maladaptive behaviors decrease?

Comments

-it doesn't make sense
-if social skills are tuaght in the context of the employment setting, will inappropriate behaviors decrease?
-does social skill training in an employment setting increase positive interactions with coworkers and decrease maladaptive behavior, and if so, how?
-if appropriate social skills are taught in the context of the employment setting, will maladaptive behaviors decrease?
-if social skills are taught in the context of the employment setting, will maladaptive behaviors decrease? How can the environment be engineered to make this happen?

Revised Question

Does social skill training conducted in an employment setting increase positive interactions with coworkers and decrease negative interactions/inappropriate behaviors, and if so, how?

Question #4

Most interventions directed at teaching social skills focus upon social performance. If social decoding skills are taught, will this strategy improve the acquisition and generalization of social behaviors in the employment setting?

Comments

-unclear
-what is meant by social decoding skills? (3)
-unclear . . . social decoding skills v. under control of the discriminative stimulus
-real good question, although at first unsure of what was meant by social decoding skills
-what are the effects of teaching social decoding skills on the acquisition of social behaviors in employment settings?
-(add) additionally, what social decoding skills should be taught to instructors (public relations skills, etc.) which will assist in successful transition?
(not included)

Revised Question

If students/youth are taught to evaluate social situations, what impact will this have on improving their social performance on the job?

Question #5

What social skills are required to be successful in the workplace? Do these skills have generality across settings?

Comments

-delete
-excellent question
-required? . . . implication is that if they don't have these skills they will be fired, might be better to address the inseparability of social skills from work behavior . . . type of job makes a great difference
-what social skills have been found to be extremely important, in that if those skills aren't existing in an individual, either they need to be taught or in some way compensated for?
-what are the requisite social skills necessary to be successful in the work environment?

Revised Question

What requisite social skills are necessary across work settings? If students do not possess these requisite skills, how should these skills be taught or otherwise compensated for in the work environment?

Question #6

What are the naturally occurring cues that set the occasion for the display of social skills in the workplace and can we bring these skills under this very subtle, yet appropriate stimulus control?

Comments

-fabulous question . . . relates to #4
-what are the combination of naturally occurring cues that set the occasion for the display of social skills in the workplace and how do we bring these skills under this very subtle, yet appropriate stimulus control?

Revised Question

What naturally occurring social cues set the occasion for other social skills in the workplace and how can we teach students/youth to respond appropriately to these cues?

Note

This question is currently under investigation by our research group.

Question #7

Can social skills interventions introduced within residential and recreation/leisure settings result in generalized performance within vocational settings?

Comments

-this question need not relate back to the vocational setting
-can social skill interventions introduced within residential and recreation/leisure settings result in generalized performance within vocational settings, and vice versa?
-how will social skill intervention introduced within residential and recreation/leisure settings result in generalized performance within vocational settings?
-(add) are the social skills displayed in the work setting dependent upon the type of work you do?
(see Question #5)
-(add) are the social skills required in the work setting the same as in the recreational/leisure setting?
(Addressed in part in Question #9; not primary focus of Transition Institute)

Revised Question

What social skill interventions introduced in one setting result in generalized performance in a second setting (e.g., simulated v. natural, residential v. employment, instructional v. noninstructional)?

Question #8

What is the most effective way to incorporate self-control, withdrawal techniques and general case programming in order to facilitate vocational community integration?

Comments

-delete
-unclear (2)
-unsure of meaning of withdrawal techniques
-self control and general case programming are incompatible
-what are effective ways to incorporate self-control, withdrawal techniques and general case programming in order to facilitate vocational community integration?
-what is the most effective way to incorporate self-control, fading, withdrawal techniques and general case programming in order to facilitate vocational community integration?

Revised Question

What rules can be formulated to guide teachers' systematic withdrawal of their instructional programs to facilitate students' independence?

Question #9 (from Small Group additional questions #9)

Can transitional strategies that result in meaningful employment for the individual be used to facilitate recreational and residential adjustment?

Additional Questions

#1 Would participation in meaningful recreational and leisure activities impact on the individuals work behavior?

#2 How does one's post work hours contribute to vocational success and general quality of life?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#3 How much instructional assistance, and for what time period, is necessary for training persons having various severity levels of retardation? (we usually say "as long as it takes," however, we should try to quantize variables such as training efficiency, time estimates and staffing needs).
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#4 How can candidates for nonsuccessful completion of transition be identified?
(Under investigation, see Task 6.3)

#5 How can policies be developed to categorize consumers into level of need and type of need?
(Under investigation, see Task 6.3)

#6 What kinds of reactions and actions come from other people in that person's environment which either stimulate or promote inappropriate or appropriate behaviors
(Under investigation, see Task 4.3)

#7 What are the naturally occurring cues that coworkers use to promote positive social skills by consumers in work settings and can these skills be taught?
(Under investigation, see Task 4.3)

#8 What is the effect of work performance of obtaining data from the service recipient (i.e., eliciting consumer input from those being trained)?
(White, D.M. & Rusch, F.R. (1984). Social validation in competitive employment: Evaluating work performance. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 4, 343-54.)

#9 What are the effects of psychotropic drugs on work performance?
(Breuning, S.E., O'Neill, M.J., & Ferguson, D.G. (1980). Comparison of psychotropic drug plus reponse cost procedures for controlling institutionalized retarded persons. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 1, 253-68.)

SMALL GROUP LEVEL QUESTIONS

Question #1

Do intervention strategies exist that can be used to change selected small groups (i.e., family, peers, work groups) viewed as instrumental in facilitating the transition from school to work? And, if no strategies exist can the components of such a strategy be identified and developed?

Comments

-good
-needs to be condensed
-emphasize components of strategy
-strategy not too crucial
-focus on identifying particular family patterns
-(add) What levels of social interaction occur between handicapped and non-handicapped peers in enclaves, work groups, etc.? Does one type of approach facilitate interaction better than another? (under consideration)

Revised Question

What strategies do family and friends use to help youth with handicaps adjust to their job? Can the effective components of these strategies be isolated and combined to yield one strategy that can be taught to advocates/significant others in the work setting?

Question #2

If individuals with handicaps are to be integrated into employment settings, it is essential that the ecology of those settings be studied and more fully understood. For example, little is known about the interests/interaction patterns displayed by potential coworkers in entry level service occupations. What are important interests/interaction patterns and how can this information be used to facilitate employment?

Comments

-real important question (3)
-too broad
-Good general strategy, however, work settings vary so much that it may not be effective to determine other than worksite by worksite
-If individuals with handicaps are to be integrated into employment settings, it is essential that the ecology of those settings be studied and more fully understood. For example, little is known about the interests/interaction patterns generally, and particularly patterns which lead to success in entry level service occupations. What are important interests/interaction patterns and how can this information be used to facilitate employment?

Revised Question

What interests/interaction patterns exist among potential coworkers and how can this information be used to facilitate employment for youth with handicaps?

Question #3

What reinforcers are most effective for increasing the likelihood that coworkers will a) act as advocates, b) participate in data collection, and/or c) participate in training?

Comments

-good question (2)
-not too important
-What conditions (part of job responsibility), and/or reinforcers are most effective for increasing the likelihood that coworkers will a) act as advocates, b) participate in data collection, and/or c) participate in training?

Revised Question

What job conditions and/or incentives are most effective for increasing the likelihood that coworkers will a) act as advocates, b) participate in data collection, and/or c) participate in training?

Question #4

What strategies are most effective for convincing parents that their children should work in nonsheltered settings?

Comments

-delete #4 . . . Would parents need to be convinced if effective data and assurances were available?
-the word convincing is offensive
-assumes all people should work in nonsheltered settings
-What strategies are most effective for convincing parents that their children should work in regular settings?

Revised Question

What strategies are most effective for enlisting parents' support for transition planning that focuses upon integrated, paid employment?

Question #5

In relation to #1, how can families, peers, and work groups facilitate the transition?

Comments

-wonderful question
-combine with #1 (2)
-needs to be more focused
-How can families, peers, and work groups facilitate the transition? Specifically, what kind of information needs to be supplied to these work groups (particularly the family) in order to involve them in the decision making process?

Combined with question #1

Question #6

What family actions, public and private services, and factors such as coordination and sequencing of services lead to the attainment of employment?

Comments

-not too important
-Whose skills are we addressing, disabled worker's or coworker's?
-unsure of what is meant by peers
-(add) Should they be introduced at all?
under consideration
-Should coworkers be introduced early in order to help in acquisition training, or later in maintenance and refinement of skills?
-How can peers be effectively trained to assist in the acquisition of work behavior?

Revised Question

How can coworkers be effectively trained to assist in the training of work-related behaviors?

Question #7

What family actions lead to the attainment of higher-status jobs with better conditions?

Comments

-not too important
-premier question . . . great
-(add) How does initial physical appearance affect coworkers behavior? (under consideration)
-(add) What can a support plan do to compensate for a lack of particular social skills?
(see question 1.5)
-What behaviors evidenced in social interactions are viewed as most aversive by coworkers, supervisors, customers or other significant others in the environment? What social behaviors are viewed as most positive by this group?

Revised Question

What behaviors evidenced in social interactions are viewed as most aversive by coworkers, supervisors, customers, or equally significant others within the work environment? What social behaviors are viewed as most positive by this group?

Question #8

Can secondary and post-secondary services be identified that have speicfic positive effects on self-sufficiency and social satisfaction with regard to employment and independent living? How do these identified service factors compare with services offered to persons who are not handicapped?

Comments

-real important/good question (5)
-How can handicapped workers best be integrated into social events, activities, and networks, how often are they involved, and what seems to work best?

Revised Question

How can employees with handicaps be integrated into social events, activities, and networks associated with work settings (e.g., off-site parties, athletic teams)?

Additional Questions

#1 Are handicapped students who will need contined programs and services being linked with adult service providers when they're in public school settings? When and how does it occur?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#2 Do individuals who are in supported employment or other types of guided vocational training and placement activities have similar assistance provided to them in pursuing leisure and recreational activities?
(under consideration)

COMMUNITY LEVEL QUESTIONS

Question #1

What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part time employment, and voluntary work) facilitate success on the job for mildly versus severely handicapped persons?

Comments

-unclear (2)
-should be restated as a continuum of disability

-How does the effectiveness of school based transition intervention vary across handicapping conditions?
-What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part time employment, and voluntary work) would be required to facilitate success for mild and/or severely handicapped workers?
-What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part time employment, voluntary work, pay waiver) facilitate success on the job for mildly versus severely handicapped? If the measurable outcome for any sort of a training, transition, or placement program is to have both integration and pay as necessary rather than one or the other, what approaches are dead ends, and which approaches may be successful approximations toward both integration and paid employment? Does segregated paid employment lead to integrated paid employment? Does integrated non-paid training lead to integrated paid employment? Does integrated volunteer placement lead to integrated paid employment?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

Revised Question

What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part time employment, voluntary work) facilitate successful employment for persons with mild to severe handicaps, physical disabilities, etc.?

Question #2

What intervention and collaborative strategies are most effective for facilitating interagency cooperation?

Comments

-excellent
-What intervention and collaborative strategies are most effective for facilitating interagency cooperation, and how can these strategies be applied to the local school level?

Revised Question

What intervention and collaborative strategies are most efficient for facilitating interagency cooperation, and how can these strategies be implemented at the LEA level?

Question #3

Who should initiate the transition planning process (e.g., teachers, rehabilitation counselors, vocational educators)?

Comments

-not important, low priority question
-family should be included as an orchestrator of transition . . . in the absence of grant funds and special projects, families are usually the crucial factor

-Who should assume the primary advocacy role in the transition planning process (e.g., teachers, rehabilitation counselors, vocational educators, etc.)?
-Who should initiate, and what are the roles and responsibilities for professionals (teachers, rehabilitation counselors, vocational educators) in the transition planning process?
-Who should initiate the transition planning process (teachers, rehabilitation counselors, vocational educators), and when should it start?
-(add) What is the respective role of each of those mentioned above? (added to question)

Revised Question

What are the most appropriate roles and responsibilities for families, teachers, rehabilitation counselors, and vocational educators in the transition planning process? When should this process start?

Question #4

What are employer's and co-worker's attitudes regarding working with handicapped persons?

Comments

-delete
-should include a mild to severe breakdown
-How do employer's and coworker's overt attitudes affect their working with persons with disability?
-What are variables that positively affect employer's and coworker's attitudes regarding working with handicapped persons?
-What are employer's and coworker's attitudes regarding working with handicapped persons? What are handicapped persons attitudes toward working with the nonhandicapped?
-What are employer's and coworker's attitudes regarding working with handicapped persons (are there really two different thrusts . . . MR and severe LD v. sensory and physical handicaps)?

Revised Question

What are employers' and coworkers' attitudes regarding working with employees with handicaps, and vice versa? Do these attitudes vary as a function of handicapping condition/severity, job type, and prior exposure to the other group?

Question #5

Are there characteristics of a business that would make it more accepting of persons with handicaps?

Comments

-not too important, low priority question
-How can a business environment be made more accepting of persons with handicaps?
-Are there characteristics of a business that would make it more accepting of persons with severe disabilities?

Revised Question

What interventions can be developed that change negative attitudes of coworkers and employers toward persons with handicaps? Do these changes affect overall community employment trends?

Question #6

What family actions, public and private services, and factors such as coordination and sequencing of services lead to the attainment of employment?

Comments

-too broad (3)
-very interesting question
-change attainment to retention
-What family actions, public and private services, and factors such as coordination and sequencing of services lead to employment?

Question dropped from consideration

Question #7

What family actions lead to the attainment of higher-status jobs with better conditions of employment?

Comments

-delete
-unclear
-not too important
-very interested in this question
-What family actions lead to higher-status jobs with better conditions of employment?

Revised Question

What variables within the family lead to the attainment of higher paying jobs, and jobs outside those considered entry level?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

Question #8

Can secondary and post-secondary services be identified that have specific positive effects on self-sufficiency and social satisfaction with regard to employment and independent living? How do these identified service factors compare with services offered to persons who are not handicapped?

Comments

-unclear
-best question of all
-What secondary and post-secondary services have been identified as having specific positive effects on self-sufficient and social satisfaction with regard to employment and independent living? How do these identified service factors compare with services offered to persons who are not handicapped?

Revised Question

Which secondary and post secondary services increase self-sufficiency and social satisfaction with competitive employment and independent living? How do these services compare with those for persons who are not handicapped?
(Referred to the Evaluation Research Group)

Question #9

What are the attitudes toward mentally handicapped persons held by key individuals within the local media? What effect do these attitudes have on vocational community integration?

Comments

-delete
-What are the attitudes toward different types of disabled persons held by key persons within the local media? What effect do these attitudes have on vocational community integration?
-What are the attitudes toward different types of disabled persons held by key persons within the local media? What effect do these attitudes have on vocational community integration?
-What has been the effect of programs such as the "Wednesday's Child" program?
-What strategies should service agencies be concerned with, in involving media to positively effect social attitudes?

Revised Question

What attitudes are portrayed by key individuals in the local media regarding persons with disabilities? What effect do these attitudes have on community integration? What strategies should educational/rehabilitation agencies use to promote positive portrayal?

Additional Questions

#1 Are schools, counselors and other public education personnel familiar with referral processes for linking exiting students with adult service programs?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#2 Given that many students, particularly those who are primarily in resource settings in secondary schools, may not have the opportunity for vocational training and/or work experience programs, to what extent have community colleges identified this as a viable program that they should be providing to serve this emerging population?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#3 What discrepancy exists between the continuing program and service needs of people exiting public schools and the capacity of adult service providers to meet these needs?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#4 (Given that the need for collaborative agreements has been established) What sort of problems are encountered after the interagency agreements are written, and how can the filtering down of these agreements to the local level (or even more specifically, the building level where most problems exist) be facilitated?
(Adopted in part; Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#5 How do prevailing local cultural values (e.g., Church of the Latter Day Saints in Utah) affect the transitioning process?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#6 What characteristics of workers who are severely handicapped are valued or devalued?
(See question 2.7)

#7 What characteristics of families assist or hinder the transition process?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#8 What are the critical variables for retention and termination of employment? What are the positive reasons for termination?
(Hanley-Maxwell, C. Rusch, F.R., Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Renzaglia, A. (in press). Factors contributing to job terminations. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.)

SOCIETAL LEVEL QUESTIONS

Question #1

Have recently revised social security regulations resulted in significant changes in the number of persons participating in income maintenance programs (e.g., SSI)?

Comments

-focus more on disincentives
-very high priority question
-list specific revisions being addressed . . . Can this question be answered by calling Social Security?

Revised Question

In what ways have recently revised social security regulations (e.g., eligibility) produced significant changes in the number of persons participating in income maintenance programs (e.g., SSI)?

Question #2

How does the state of the economy affect the type of adult, vocational services that are offered to persons with handicaps?

Comments

-not important
-revise to reflect changing demographics
-(add) How does state legislation affect the type of adult vocational services (mandated) that are offered to persons with handicaps?
(under consideration)
-How and to what degree does the state of the economy affect the type of adult vocational, community adjustment, or independent living services that are offered to persons with handicaps?

Revised Question

How has the "state of the economy" influenced the nature of employment training programs offered to persons with handicaps?

Question #3

Do societal trends (studied via historical analysis) in attitudes toward social services affect employment of persons with handicaps?

Comments

-revise to reflect changing demographics
-delete (2)
-very interested in this question

Question dropped from consideration

Question #4

Is there a relationship between the state of the economy and societal attitudes toward persons with handicaps?

Comments

-What is the relationship between the state of the economy and societal attitudes toward persons with handicaps?

Question dropped from consideration

Question #5

Who defines SSI policy? Upon what information base do they develop these policies? Which group or key individuals influence these policy makers?

Comments

-delete
-unclear
-very high priority

Revised Question

Who develops income maintenance program policies for individuals with handicaps? Upon what information base do they develop these policies? Which group or key individuals influence these policy makers? What interventions can be developed to influence these policy makers to formulate new guidelines that support independence?

Question #6

What conditions (economic, political, etc.) existed prior to times of significant positive change in societal attitudes toward the handicapped, and how were these conditions facilitated?

Comments

-delete
-has been done before
-very interested in this question
-perhaps investigate a "Megatrends" type of approach to what will be the status of handicapped persons in the year 2000 rather than taking a historical perspective

Question dropped from consideration

Additional Questions

#1 Some states under court order have established a level of community based services necessary to insure appropriate programming for people being deinstitutionalized. Using that standard as a minimum level of programming, to what extent do like handicapped individuals have access to the same types of programs and services?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#2 Making the assumption that some severely handicapped individuals who age out of public schools are unable to link with adult service providers, or enroll in any sort of supported employment programs . . . are they then just going home? How does this affect the family of these persons who have been assured that there would be 6-8 hours/day of employment provided? What are the results of "unfulfilled promises?"
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group, addressed in 6.4)

#3 Advances in technology have enabled many handicapped individuals who previously were perceived to be unemployable attain employment in both independent and supported environments, however some individuals' current level of functioning is so low that technology has not been able to bring them to a point or readiness. What happens to this group?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#4 Supported employment implies that individuals in day activity programs could more positively benefit through integration and opportunity to derive benefits of work. To what extent should we realistically speak of work for the total population of day activity programs? Do the current day activity programs enroll the most severely handicapped? Should we reconsider the notion to do away with day activity programs?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group 6.1 and 6.4)

#5 How can transition effectiveness be measured? What kinds of methods exist to measure what has been successful? Whose responsibility is it to evaluate?
(Referred to Evaluation Research Group)

#6 Are there substantial disincentives for employment? How can these be modified?
(Addressed in 4.1)

Appendix E

Survey Questionnaire

What is your current state and county of residence?
State (U.S. territory, etc.)_____
County_____

Of which of the following ethnic groupings do you consider yourself a member?
___Asian/Pacific islander
___Black
___Hispanic
___White
___American Indian
___Other (please specify_____)

Please list current association/organization membership(s) you hold:
_____
_____

Please check all of the following which best describe your current position.
___Special Educator
___Vocational Educator
___Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
___University Faculty/Researcher
___Local Administrator
___State Administrator
___Parent
___Funded Project Director
___Other (please specify_____)

The setting in which you interact the most on behalf of students with disabilities is:
___University
___Public school serving students with and without handicaps
___Public school serving students with handicaps only
___Private school serving students with handicaps only
___Private Agency
___Other (please specify_____)
___Residential institution
___Group home
___Medical/hospital setting
___Research center
___State/Governmental Agency

I spend most of my time with or am most actively involved with persons/students/clients who are:
___Learning disabled
___Mildly mentally retarded
___Moderately mentally retarded
___Severely/profoundly mentally retarded
___Physically handicapped
___Sensory impaired
___Emotionally disturbed
___Behavior disordered
___Multiple handicapped
___Autistic
___Other (please specify_____)

The following items are related to your past experience. Please check the items that best complete the statements. I have direct clinical (hands-on) experience with persons/students/clients with: (check all which apply)
___Learning disabilities
___Mild mental retardation
___Moderate mental retardation
___Severe/profound mental retardation
___Physical handicaps
___Sensory impairments
___Emotional disturbance
___Behavior disorders
___Multiple handicaps
___Autism
___Other (please specify_____)

Number of years of direct clinical experiences: (check one only)
___1 year or less
___2-3 years
___4-5 years
___More than 5 years

My direct clinical experience occurred:
___within the last 3 years
___within the last 4-10 years
___more than ten years ago

The highest degree I have attained:
___High School
___Associate (2 year program)
___Bachelor's
___Master's
___Specialist
___Doctorate

Glossary

Evaluate Social Situations - The ability to pick up subtle cues such as body language, tone of voice, etc. in social situations, and use these cues to guide ones own social behavior.

General Case Programming - A curriculum method used to teach skills that result in a higher probability that the skills learned in one instructional setting (e.g., the classroom) will be successfully performed in a different setting with a different stimulus. For example, a person is taught to use one type of soft drink machine in one setting, and then is able to use a different soft drink machine in a different setting because of general case programming.

Intervention and Collaborative Strategies - Ways to facilitate group change, or increased cooperation.

Self Instructional Package - A procedure of verbally directing oneself to behave in a desired manner.

Transition - The life changes that occur when people move from high school to the working world.

Please circle one number for each of the following

1. What strategies do family and friends use to help youth with handicaps adjust to their job? Can the effective components of these strategies by isolated and combined to yield one strategy that can be taught to advocates/significant others in the work setting? (sg1)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

2. What rules can be formulated to guide teachers' systematic withdrawal of their instructional programs to facilitate students' independence? (i8)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

3. What job conditions and/or incentives are most effective for increasing the likelihood that coworkers will a) act as advocates, b) participate in data collection, and/or c) participate in training? (sg3)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

4. What interests/interaction patterns exist among potential coworkers and how can this information be used to facilitate employment for youth with handicaps? (sg2)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

5. Can transitional strategies that result in meaningful employment for the individual be used to facilitate recreational and residential adjustment? (i9)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

6. What behaviors evidenced in social interactions are viewed as most negative by coworkers, supervisors, customers, or equally significant others within the work environment? What social behaviors are viewed as most positive by this group? (sg6)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

7. In what ways have recently revised social security regulations (e.g., eligibility) produced significant changes in the number of persons participating in income maintenance programs (e.g., Supplemental Security Income)? (s1)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

8. If students/youth are taught to evaluate social situations, what impact will this have on improving their social performance on the job? (i4)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

9. What are the most appropriate roles and responsibilities for families, teachers, rehabilitation counselors, and vocational educators in the transition planning process? When should this process start? (c3)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

10. What intervention and collaborative strategies are most efficient for facilitating interagency cooperation, and how can these strategies be implemented at the local educational agency level? (c2)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

11. What type of self-instructional package can students use to develop their independence on the job? What components of this package contribute most in accounting for students becoming independent? (i1)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

12. What naturally occurring social behaviors prompt other social skills in the workplace and how can we teach students/youth to respond appropriately to these cues? (i6)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

13. What social skills are necessary across work settings? If students do not possess these skills, how should these skills be taught or otherwise compensated for in the work environment? (i5)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

14. What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part-time employment, and voluntary work) facilitate successful employment for persons with mild to severe handicaps, physical disabilities, etc.? (c1)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

15. If general-case programming is used to teach vocational skills/behaviors outside the work setting, how effectively will these target skills/behaviors carry over to actual work settings? (i2)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

16. What social skill teaching strategies introduced in one setting result in generalized performance in a second setting (e.g., simulated v. natural, residential v. employment, instructional v. noninstructional). (i7)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

17. What are employers' and coworkers' attitudes regarding working with employees with handicaps, and vice versa? Do these attitudes vary across handicapping condition/severity, job type, and prior exposure to the other group? (c4)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

18. How has the "state of the economy" influenced the nature of employment training programs offered to persons with handicaps? (s2)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

19. Who develops income maintenance program policies for individuals with handicaps? Upon what information base do they develop these policies? Which group or key individuals influence these policy makers? What interventions can be developed to influence these policy makers to formulate new guidelines that support independence? (s3)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

20. What teaching strategies can be developed that change negative attitudes of coworkers and employers toward persons with handicaps? Do these changes affect overall community employment trends? (c5)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

21. How can coworkers be taught to assist in the training and evaluation of behaviors related to work? (sg5)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

22. Can social skill training conducted in an employment setting increase positive interactions with coworkers and decrease negative interactions/inappropriate behaviors, and if so, how? (i3)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

23. What strategies are most effective for enlisting parents' support for transition planning that focuses upon, paid employment? (sg4)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

24. How can employees with handicaps be integrated into social events, activities, and networks associated with work settings (e.g., off-site parties, athletic teams, spectator sports)? (sg7)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

25. What attitudes are portrayed by key individuals in the local media regarding persons with disabilities? What effect do these attitudes have on employment? What strategies should educational/rehabilitation agencies use to promote positive portrayal? (c6)

Absolutely Essential				Moderately Important					Not At All Important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	98

Please supply us with questions you would like to see our research group address.

1.

2.

3.

Appendix F

Survey Letter

Dear Colleague:

We at the University of Illinois' Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute are studying ways to assist persons with handicaps to move from high school to successful employment. As might be imagined, there are many interwoven issues which impact upon such an effort. We have identified areas important to us in the form of the 25 attached questions. Although we feel these areas are significant, we would like to gain your perceptions of how important these are to you. In order to help you to do this, we have listed our questions with a rating scale which ranges from "Absolutely Important" to "Moderately Important" to "Not At All Important." After you have read a question, please circle any number from 1 through 10 to indicate how important that question is to you based upon your experience with persons with handicaps. If for any reason (question unclear, unsure of how to answer, etc.) you feel you cannot rate a question from 1 to 10, please circle "98" indicating "Don't Know." Please do not leave any rating scale blank as a non-response will be scored as "Don't Know." Additionally, please note the open-ended question which allows you to add questions you feel are more deserving of our attention than those questions posed. It is quite likely that several new questions may be addressed this year, or next. Feel free to write on the back of the questionnaire if more space is needed.

Because of the technical nature of many of the questions, a brief glossary of terms is included to provide clarity. Once again, however, should a question still be unclear, "Don't Know" should be marked.

Prior to rating the 25 questions, we request that you provide basic information on your background and experience. A code number appears on the survey to allow us to insure an adequate response rate is achieved, and to allow us to follow-up surveys that are not returned. Please be assured, however, that your responses will be coded and we will not be able to match any specific response to you after the final follow-up contact.

We ask that you return the completed rating in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by March 10. If we do not receive a response from you we will contact you again in early February. We greatly appreciate your assistance in our prioritizing our research objectives, and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Rusch, Director
Research Program

FRR:jck
Enclosures

Appendix G

Follow-up Letter

Dear Colleague:

We trust that you have received our survey, and have had the opportunity to rate the research questions. We are genuinely interested in your ratings, and look forward to your response. Thank-you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire, and sending it back to us.

Should you have already returned the survey, we appreciate your assistance, and please disregard this letter. If you have not as yet completed the survey, please take the time to do so, and thank-you for your help with the National Research Needs Assessment.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Rusch
Research Program

FRR/jc

Appendix H

Listing of Questions in Order of Ranking

Listing of Questions in Order of Ranking
(n=294)

(1)9.What are the most appropriate roles and responsibilities for families, teachers, rehabilitation counselors, and vocational educators in the transition planning process? When should this process start? (c3)

(2)13.What social skills are necessary across work settings? If students do not possess these skills, how should these skills be taught or otherwise compensated for in the work environment? (i5)

(3)6.What behaviors evidenced in social interactions are viewed as most negative by coworkers, supervisors, customers, or equally significant others within the work environment? What social behaviors are viewed as most positive by this group? (sg6)

(4)10.What intervention and collaborative strategies are most efficient for facilitating interagency cooperation, and how can these strategies be implemented at the local educational agency level? (c2)

(6)23.What strategies are most effective for enlisting parents' support for transition planning that focuses upon, paid employment? (sg4)

(5)8.If students/youth are taught to evaluate social situations, what impact will this have on improving their social performance on the job? (i4)

(7)12.What naturally occurring social behaviors prompt other social skills in the workplace and how can we teach students/youth to respond appropriately to these cues? (i6)

(8)1.What strategies do family and friends use to help youth with handicaps adjust to their job? Can the effective components of these strategies be isolated and combined to yield one strategy that can be taught to advocates/significant others in the work setting? (sg1)

(10)22.Can social skill training conducted in an employment setting increase positive interactions with coworkers and decrease negative interactions/inappropriate behaviors, and if so, how? (i3)

(14)3.What job conditions and/or incentives are most effective for increasing the likelihood that coworkers will a) act as advocates, b) participate in data collection, and/or c) participate in training? (sg3)

(12)16.What social skill teaching strategies introduced in one setting result in generalized performance in a second setting (e.g., simulated v. natural, residential v. employment, instructional v. noninstructional).

(11)14.What alternative work patterns (e.g., flextime, permanent part-time employment, and voluntary work) facilitate successful employment for persons with mild to severe handicaps, physical disabilities, etc? (c1)

(15)2.What rules can be formulated to guide teachers' systematic withdrawal of their instructional programs to facilitate students' independence? (i8)

(9)20.What teaching strategies can be developed that change negative attitudes of coworkers and employers toward persons with handicaps? Do these changes affect overall community employment trends? (c5)

(17)15.If general-case programming is used to teach vocational skills/behaviors outside the work setting, how effectively will these target skills/behaviors carry over to actual work settings? (i2)

(13)17.What are employers' and coworkers' attitudes regarding working with employees with handicaps, and vice versa? Do these attitudes vary across handicapping condition/severity, job type, and prior exposure to the other group? (c4)

(16)19.Who develops income maintenance program policies for individuals with handicaps? Upon what information base do they develop these policies? Which group or key individuals influence these policy makers? What interventions can be developed to influence these policy makers to formulate new guidelines that support independence? (s3)

(19)4.What interests/interaction patterns exist among potential coworkers and how can this information be used to facilitate employment for youth with handicaps? (sg2)

(18)5.Can transitional strategies that result in meaningful employment for the individual be used to facilitate recreational and residential adjustment? (i9)

(21)7.In what ways have recently revised social security regulations (e.g., eligibility) produced significant changes in the number of persons participating in income maintenance programs (e.g., Supplemental Security Income)? (s1)

(22)11.What type of self-instructional package can students use to develop their independence on the job? What components of this package contribute most in accounting for students becoming independent? (i1)

(24)21.How can coworkers be taught to assist in the training and evaluation of behaviors related to work? (sg5)

(20)24.How can employees with handicaps be integrated into social events, activities, and networks associated with work settings (e.g., off-site parties, athletic teams, spectator sports)? (sg7)

(25)18.How has the "state of the economy" influenced the nature of employment training programs offered to persons with handicaps? (s2)

(23)25.What attitudes are portrayed by key individuals in the local media regarding persons with disabilities? What effect do these attitudes have on employment? What strategies should educational/rehabilitation agencies use to promote positive portrayal? (c6)

Appendix I

Analysis of Variance Across Respondent Groups

Analysis of variance among respondent groups

Question	Significance of F
#1	.095
#2	.039*
#3	.447
#4	.783
#5	.215
#6	.242
#7	.947
#8	.001**
#9	.401
#10	.001**
#11	.747
#12	.359
#13	.329
#14	.816
#15	.380
#16	.028**
#17	.077
#18	.060***
#19	.404
#20	.618
#21	.333
#22	.979
#23	.832
#24	.230
#25	.615

* F is significant at the .05 level
** F is significant at the .05 level and Sheffe test also shows significant difference
*** Scheffe test alone shows significant difference

Appendix J

Study 3 Categories

Study 3 Categories

1. Inservice/preservice training: Professional training in areas related to transition

2. Transition model program research and development: Specific transition program characteristics including,

   -educational strategies
   -variations among programs
   -assessment
   -program logistics (e.g., transportation)

3. Curriculum to prepare for transition from school to independent living or work

4. Factors relating to client characteristics/client outcomes; and attitudes.

   -client perceptions re: transition
   -client needs
   -severity of handicap and outcomes

5. Parent/advocate involvement

6. Characteristics of specific jobs

   -segregation v. integration
   -work situations
   -employer/coworkers

7. Federal/state legislation and policy

8. Program Evaluation

9. Business/industry linkages

10. Interagency collaboration

11. Other

Appendix K

Survey Questions/Comments

Survey Questions/Comments

PROJECT DIRECTORS

1. What are the "workable and working" models for local service delivery cost sharing?

2. What work situations result in long-term retention?

3. What impact does segregation of more than 2 disabled workers in a business have on the attitudes and acceptance of coworkers and employers?

4. Subsidized employment

5. Effectiveness of support systems

6. Parent involvement

7. Efficacy of different transitional models (e.g., supported work model, voc ed/spec ed cooperative model). This could also be x exceptionality.

8. Cost effectiveness of different models.

*9. Your questions are too limited in their focus Frank. This is a perfect example of your orientation and training and does not reflect a true Transition focus and orientation. You chose to define Transition from your or colleague perception and did not take into consideration a broader focus. Please refer to DCR positive paper on transition. Your questions relate primarily to work and do not address personal social, daily living or occupational and guidance areas and so on.... I would suggest that you give it another try.

10. What evaluations and/or assessments are most valid when advising the physically disabled high school student on appropriate career directions?

11. How can evaluation results be written up so they are applicable to both IEP's and IWRP's.

12. How does the client view a "meaningful quality of life in the community"?

    * Looks like you covered it -- nice job!

    * I would appreciate results mailed to all requested to reply.

13. Impact of state agencies via mandated legislation (i.e. Discrimination, Access, Equal Opportunities)

---

* Questions/comments removed from consideration

14. Role of local advocates

15. Tendency to equate special needs with retardation

16. What activities in transition programs appear to be most effective in facilitating transition?

17. What programs are stressing activities that vary from the patterns of evaluation, general and specific work skills, placement and follow along?

18. What strategies help agencies to really work together in planning and delivery services?

19. How can interagency cooperation be increased to facilitate more effective service provision with less duplication of services?

20. Impact of rising standards/graduation requirements on youth with mild handicaps.

21. Secondary program factors that lead to "adult success".

*22. Your questions are generally on target although I do think that many answers are already available. My concern is that the transition focus is too heavily slanted toward the severely handicapped population. Although there is much work to do in making changes within systems to encourage change for this population we do have demonstrated models that work. Our special ed high school population who are mildly handicapped continue to be our highest dropout group with potential for unemployment, crucial involvement, mental health involvement, etc.

23. What strategies are most successful for creating alternative work options for students with disabilities? How can parents, schools, and adult agencies work together to make this happen?

24. What types of sec/voc programs enhance paid adult employment for students with different loadings?

25. What social skill assessment and instructional strategies are most effective for students with mild, moderate, or severe handicaps.

26. What barriers have collaborative agencies identified and how have they been solved?

27. Attitude and cooperation levels of community agencies receiving transition referrals from public schools.

28. Most widely used programs for transition after youth leave the public school system (e.g., community agency, supported employment, independent employment, etc.).

---

* Questions/comments removed from consideration

29. Analysis of different transition services needed for severely handicapped vs. mildly handicapped.

30. How to "motivate" school systems to use "community classrooms" - that is training in the community settings rather than in classroom situations where training doesn't generalize.

31. How to interface the educational system with adult services for programmatic continuity after graduation or age 22?

32. How to best develop feedback loops between the needs of the business community for certain types of training and the training actually provided by the school system in that community.

* Note: Many of your questions seem to focus on areas for which there is a substantial body of research in the field of industrial/organizational psychology.

33. The degree to which the severity of disability effects job opportunities, agency support, employer cooperation, and training opportunities.

34. Impacts school personnel can have with transition process for severe/multiply handicapped.

35. Need to explore transportation alternatives, especially in a rural setting.

36. Inservice training geared towards school, DRS, community agencies, facilities, to allow key staff (teachers, counselors, etc.) to become more familiar with each others services, programming, problems, needs, etc.

37. What collaborative strategies are most effective in increasing school and agency cooperation in developing transition programming for students at an early age (15 to 22), to facilitate employment and independence upon graduation?

38. What teaching strategies are most effective in school and community-based settings that will increase a severe/profound individuals independence in employment at a competitive job site?

39. What intervention strategies are most effective, i.e., coworker prompting, in reducing inappropriate social behaviors that are low incident behaviors that result in termination, i.e., violence, etc.? (from the job site)

*40. I would avoid the use of term "evaluate" for interaction between co-workers and persons with handicap (question #21) as it sets the stage for inequality and possible social problems. Perhaps this is just semantics, but I would speak about feedback but not about evaluation (unless the coworker is in a supervisory position).

---

*Questions/comments removed from consideration

* The questionnaire addresses the most salient concerns facing transition service providers.

41. How do/or do attitudes of co-workers toward handicapped employees change and what influences that change (factors that influence it)?

42. How do/or do attitudes of employers toward hiring handicapped workers change and what influences that change?

43. Whta type of exposure influences effective change in both employers and co-workers toward handicapped workers - on site actual experience; "hands-on" type instructional seminars; etc. etc.

44. What strategies are most effective in promoting improved communication among special educators, vocational educators and parents at the high school program level.

45. What alternative program components can be developed/incorporated to train students/youths to become "job ready" i.e., to acquire pre-vocational skills?

46. What types of pre-employment training strategies have been effective being generalized to an actual employment setting?

47. Decision-making processes (of youth with handicaps, parents, educators, providers, employers) relative to progress toward employment options.

48. Transportation options and employment.

49. Can human service providers lobby effectively to reduce government sponsored disincentives to hiring handicapped persons in the private sector? i.e. 1. change SSI eligibility so handicapped can work and still receive at least partial benefits. 2. restore TJTC

50. What public school special education programs best prepare students for transition?

51. What are the alternatives to general case programming as a means to promote adaptability?

52. Is adaptability more than just socialization?

---

* Questions/comments removed from consideration

*53. This survey was difficult for me to accurately respond to. I have responsibility for voc. programming for all disabilities in my state. The question that arises for me is? - Which is more important to the total system - Vocational and transitioning support for the mildly handicapped which constitutes 90% of the special education population in our state. Or do we place highest priority on the unserved or underserved, i.e. the more severely disabled which have needs but often have limited potential and require services that are very high cost. With limited fiscal and personnel resources where does one place one's emphasis and what research will truly contribute to the knowledge base to assist in serving the greatest portion of the disabled population.

54. How can parents (caregivers of disabled youth and young adults provide more job explorations in the community? (e.g. taking these young people in to talk with employers, visit job sites - basic exposure to the range of occupations that exist in their community.)

55. To what extent are existing vocational assessment data used by transition programs and adult services in determining interventions and job placement/followup services?

56. What is the knowledge-base of parents regarding transition and transition related issues? Can major concerns be identified so that parent manuals can be developed? (also training programs for parents of transition-age children.)

57. What are teachers', rehabilitative counselors', guidance counselors' attitudes toward appropriate aspiration levels of disabled students.

58. What strategies can be employed to encourage above to raise expectations, hopes, aspirations of students and their parents?

59. Many "knowledgeable, sensitive" professionals with years of experience working with disabled persons harbor the worst attitudes vis-a-vis what the youngsters can become.

60. What unique programs and services are needed to facilitate community adjustment outside of the workplace?

61. To what extent is success in the areas of vocational adjustment accompanied by success in other areas of community adjustment?

62. How can we define, develop and operationalize a concept of "supported living" that is analogous to the currently popular concept of "supported employment"?

---

* Questions/comments removed from consideration

RESEARCHERS

63. Issues regarding transportation are of major importance in transition.

64. Adaptations that allow persons with severe physical disabilities to perform meaningful work.

65. Step-by-step guide for getting through the adult service maze - how to get 1619 a/b when told by SS that a client somehow "doesn't qualify".

66. How do we learn to deal with people as individuals rather than members of a deviant category?

67. Role of Secondary School Programming in preparation of handicapped students for Transition (effectiveness measures).

* Are you talking about issues or research questions? You've mixed the objectives and then asked me (us) to work "small target areas". Best to refine the questions.

* You are really heavy in social skills. Where are the "issues" related to training of employment skills (vocational skills)?

68. I get the impression that you are highly interested in issues related to severe disability in the intelligence domain. There are an ample number of disabled people who are not covered by your questions.

69. How do exemplary curriculum components differ across handicapping conditions and their severity relative to transition programming from school to work? How "deep" into the secondary/middle school curriculum is the notion of transition planning most reasonably and effectively introduced?

70. The status of adult service agency follow-through--incompatibility of training in natural work environments with adult services orientation.

71. The effects of a strong preparatory curriculum in school on work and its maintenance.

* This instrument is poorly designed. Its "stems" are too complicated, and there are no instructions to guide the respondent.

STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

72. Who is responsible for initiating transitional options when the student either completes her/his high school program or reaches age 21?

---

* Questions/comments removed from consideration

73. What are some vocational education competencies that can be best implemented as innovative/model programs for transitional services?

74. Appropriate vocational education personnel will be available to assist in the vocational planning of transitional services.

75. What part of available resources for applicable programs is directed to staff development and coping enhancement of professionals and others that affect or are affected by interaction with the handicapped?

76. What strategies are most effective in increasing the participation of disabled individuals in postsecondary education especially among those who have participated in secondary special education?

77. What are the impacts/effects of such participation on future employment, wages, living independently etc.

78. What assessment data and information should be secured and utilized for placement in a program and for employment?

79. What assessment instruments are valid and reliable for measuring physical, mental, social, and emotional factors for each classification of handicapped person, i.e., blind, deaf, mentally retarded, orthopedically impaired, learning disabilities?

80. What follow-up studies should be done after the transition period is completed?

81. What are the most effective support strategies for handicapped students mainstreamed in vocational education courses leading to post school goals?

82. What is the role of guidance in transitional planning for handicapped youth?

83. Specific long term follow-up information comparing input of specific in-school vocational programming activity vs. on-the-site training model - (long term job growth - job potential, quality of life etc.)

84. Effective pre-vocational development as an integrated part of specified educators curriculum, including the career development components. Models for disabilities.

85. Improved on-going integrated voc. assessment processes begin early in the child's experience.

86. Type of job success for different handicapping conditions.

87. How can advocacy (blind, deaf, CP, etc.) groups become involved in provision of assistance and support with the independent living portion of transition?

88. Who are the key personnel in the private sector who need to be involved in a transition program and what should their role be?

89. What are the key strategies needed for training the private sector to become trainers for handicapped?

STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

90. The degree to which educations movement back to career education meets the challenge of the OSERS Transition initiative.

91. The Point of VR intervention being determined by the degree to which education provides career awareness, career exploration, experienced based career education, career preparation and career placement and follow-up.

92. Which have you found to be the more effective... Training prior to attempted job placement or vice versa?

93. What has been the impact of specialized vocational education programs at the high school level?

94. What are the advantages/disadvantages of teaching co-workers, employers, etc., versus providing experience in working with the disabled?

95. What are the advantages/disadvantages of teaching the disabled social skills versus providing a opportunity to interact on a job site and allow reinforcement of appropriate/inappropriate actions to come from co-workers?

96. Does early intervention make the transition process smoother? What grade level (or age) makes the most impact?

97. Does actual work experience during high school enhance the possibility of adult employment? Would classroom instruction regarding work offer more?

98. Are handicapped individuals more successful (higher pay - longer job retention) in large businesses and corporations?

99. How can jobs be created to insure that individuals with handicaps have "jobs" at the end of their training?

100. What are the legal, regulatory and administrative limits the various agencies relating with handicapped individuals have with respect to authority to work with each handicapping condition and financing of services.

101. Effective interagency planning document that begins before school leaving and carries over into initial years of employment.

102. Can you convince the legislature for an appropriation to employ clients in transition program?

103. The issue of transition for those handicapped students who will be moving from high school to post-secondary educational settings.

104. Which state agency should coordinate the overall transition process for handicapped youth, and why?

105. What inclusive transition strategies should be utilized for mildly handicapped youth?

106. Should special education teachers actually initiate vocational placements in the community for handicapped youth, or should this responsibility rest with a qualified vocational person?

107. At what point do parents/guardians cease to be a key factor and we must then focus our efforts on the disabled individual (who is now living more independently as an adult "head of household")?

108. What is "normal" interaction between coworkers? Are we setting realistic expectations of "normal"?

109. Investigate the success of programs such as supported employment and Job Share.

110. How successful has the use of computers by persons with disabilities (severe) been in obtaining competitive employment?

111. Has the expansion of accessible public transportation over the last five years made a significant impact on the ability of the handicapped population to participate in employment nationally?

112. Ways and means of generating support for funding for supported employment for the most severely and profoundly disabled.

113. Curricula to train job coaches/job trainers.

114. What "areas of occupations" have proved to be most significant in growth factor of handicapped individuals re: happiness, promotion, salary?

115. What impact has support services (vocational) had on graduates of secondary programs?

Appendix L

Category Assignment of Questions/Comments

Category Assignment of Questions/Comments

	Categories										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Researchers	63 64 67 70	69 71	66				65				4
State Directors	75 98 99	73 74 76 77 82 83 85 89 95 110 111 113	84 91	86 108	87 96		100 102 112	78 79 80 81 90 93 109	88 92	72 94 101 104	106
Project Directors	30 56 58 59	4 5 7 10 11 16 17 23 25 29 35 38 39 48 51	20 45 46 62	12 15 21 33	6 14 47 54 56 107	2 3 41 42 43	13 49	8 24 28 34 50 55 60 61	32	1 18 19 26 27 31 37 44	52 57

Research Faculty at the University of Illinois

Janis Chadsey-Rusch
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Special Education

Lizanne DeStefano
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Educational Psychology

Jane Dowling
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Special Education

James W. Halle
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

Delwyn L. Harnisch
Assistant Professor of
Educational Psychology

Laird W. Heal
Professor of Special
Education

Robert L. Linn
Professor of Educational
Psychology

L. Allen Phelps
Professor of Vocational
Education

Adelle M. Renzaglia
Associate Professor of
Special Education

Frank R. Rusch
Professor of Special
Education

Richard P. Schutz
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Special Education

Robert E. Stake
Professor of Educational
Psychology

Institute Advisory Committee

Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute
University of Illinois

Donn Brolin, Ph.D.
Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology
University of Missouri-Columbia

R. Brian Cobb, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
University of Vermont

Marge Goldberg, *Co-Director*
Pacer Center
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Sally S. Höerr, *President*
National Parent Chain
Peoria, Illinois

Dean Inman, Ph.D.
Director of NERC
Center on Human Development
University of Oregon

Luanna Meyer, Ph.D.
Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Syracuse University

William Schill, Ph.D.
College of Education
University of Washington

Susan S. Suter, *Director*
Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services

Edna Szymanski
American Rehabilitation Counseling Association
Senior Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
New York State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Craig Thornton, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research
Princeton, New Jersey

Paul Wehman, Ph.D.
Director
Rehabilitation, Research and Training Center
Virginia Commonwealth University